

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 22, 23 and 25 are amended. Claims 4 and 17-21 have been withdrawn from consideration. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-3, 5-16 and 22-30 continue to read on the elected species and claim 1 is generic to non-elected claims 4 and 17-21. Rejoinder of claims 4 and 17-21 is requested when claim 1 is found allowable.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Knable in the September 22, 2009 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Mallory, U.S. Patent No. 4,007,081 (Mallory I), or Mallory et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,833,445 (Mallory II). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites that the core body is constructed such that, in a partially expanded state, side surfaces of the rigid support members provide support for the center bladder at a position corresponding to a radial position of bead cores when the carcass band folding-back means is actuated. As discussed during the telephone interview, Mallory II fails to teach or suggest these features because Mallory II provides support using bead back-up supporting means 80 as can clearly be seen, for example, in Mallory II's Fig. 14. Mallory I suffers from similar deficiencies as can be seen, for example, in Mallory I's Fig. 23.

Claim 1 recites that the center bladder is expandable or contractible independently of the movement of the rigid support members, both in axial and radial directions, and thereby fully expands a carcass band to a toroidal shape independent of the core body. Applicants respectfully assert that the applied references fail to teach or suggest these features.

The Office Action alleges that both Mallory I and Mallory II teach a center bladder that is expandable or contractible independently of the movement of the rigid support members. The Office Action alleges that Mallory I shows a bladder that is sufficiently resilient to be expandable and therefore the bladder is capable of being gripped from some outside suction device and thereby expanded. The Office Action also alleges that Mallory II teaches a bladder (drum sleeve 36) that is expandable or contractible by inflation (citing col. 12, lines 1-16) and that this inflation and deflation is capable of being independent of the movement of the core body (citing Fig. 18 and col. 12, lines 46-49). However, neither Mallory I nor Mallory II fully expands a carcass band to a toroidal shape independent of the core body. That is, both Mallory I and Mallory II expand a carcass band using their alleged respective rigid support members. The configuration of claim 1 allows for uniform support of a carcass band center portion, resulting in a more smooth and uniform bonding surface with a belt member. See the originally filed specification at paragraph [0010].

Claims 2 and 3 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the for the additional features they recite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mallory I or Mallory II in view of Gazuit, DE 2124978 (Gazuit I), and Gutknecht et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,318,434. Claims 8-16, 25, 26, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mallory I or Mallory II (or for claim 27 only, in view of Gazuit I and Gutknecht) in view of Gazuit I and Gazuit, GB 1524369 (Gazuit II). Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mallory I or Mallory II in view of Frazier et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,684,621, and Irie, U.S. Patent No. 4,468,267. Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mallory I or Mallory II in view of Gazuit or Gazuit II and Stevens, U.S. Patent No. 2,605,197. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, neither Mallory I nor Mallory II teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 1. Further, none of the additional applied references overcome the deficiencies of Mallory I and Mallory II. Thus, claims 5-16 and 22-30 are patentable by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite.

It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-30 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks
Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/bab

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: September 25, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--